



RECEIVED  
AUG 02 1983

EXECUTIVE DEPT.

State of New Jersey

IRWIN I. KIMMELMAN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

THOMAS W. GREELISH  
FIRST ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY

DIVISION OF LAW

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SECTION

RICHARD J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX  
CN 112  
TRENTON 08625

MICHAEL R. COLE  
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  
DIRECTOR

LAWRENCE E. STANLEY  
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL  
SECTION CHIEF

JOHN M. VAN DALEN  
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL  
ASSISTANT SECTION CHIEF

TELEPHONE 609-292-1548

July 29, 1983

Honorable Reginald Stanton  
Superior Court of New Jersey  
228 Hall of Records  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Re: State of New Jersey, Department of Environmental  
Protection v. Scientific Chemical Processing, Inc., et al  
Docket No. L-1852-83E

Dear Judge Stanton:

I am in receipt of Mr. Egan's objections to my proposed Order. I respectfully submit that said objections are without merit.

Based upon a review of my notes, I believe paragraph 3 of the proposed order is fully consistent with positions taken by Your Honor and DEP at the hearing. I advised the court of DEP's position explaining that Inmar's plan was unacceptable because it lacked sufficient detail for evaluation. It was my understanding that Your Honor agreed with this position. Indeed, I recall discussions between the court and Mr. Egan regarding the lack of information submitted in connection with the analytical aspects of Inmar's proposal. It was on this basis that the court directed Inmar to have its technical representatives meet with DEP to develop a comprehensive cleanup plan.

Regarding paragraph 4, I believe that the court and all parties agreed that a chemical analysis of all waste present on the Newark and Carlstadt sites must be a first step of the cleanups. Further, you directed that the cleanups start promptly after meetings are held between the technical representatives of the defendants and DEP. Therefore, I respectfully submit that paragraph 4 is consistent with Your Honor's ruling from the bench.

345778



July 29, 1983

During oral argument, I stated that Messrs. Presto and Sigmond had not submitted plans for cleanup of the Carlstadt site as required by the court's order at the return date of the Order To Show Cause. Thereafter, the court ordered Mr. Sigmond and Mr. Presto to submit their plans of the cleanup of the Carlstadt site by August 5, 1983. In the alternative, the court granted the option that these individuals may join in the plan submitted by Inmar Associates. Finally, my notes specifically indicate that you directed that these individuals attend the meeting with the State regarding the cleanup of the Carlstadt site.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully yours,

IRWIN I. KIMMELMAN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By

David W. Reger

David W. Reger

Deputy Attorney General

DWR:map

cc: Harriet Sims Harvey, Esq.  
Paul S. Barbier, Esq.  
Edward J. Egan, Esq.  
Mr. Herbert G. Case  
Mr. Leif R. Sigmond  
Jerry Burke, Esq.

July 14, 1983

Paul S. Barbier, Esq.  
Presto & Barbire  
15 Glen Road  
Rutherford, New Jersey 07076

Harriet Sims Harvey, Esq.  
71 Spring Lane  
Englewood, New Jersey 07631

Mr. Leif R. Sigmond  
215 Comanche Drive  
Oceanport, New Jersey 07757

Mr. Herbert G. Case  
571 Mountainview Terrace  
Dunnellen, New Jersey 08812

Re: State of New Jersey, Department of Environmental Protection v.  
Scientific Chemical Processing, Inc. et al.  
Docket No. L-1852-83E

Dear Mrs. Harvey and Gentlemen:

A meeting to discuss the cleanup proposal for the Carlstadt site has been set up for Tuesday, July 19, 1983 at 10:00 AM at Mr. Reger's office in the Hughes Justice Complex at Trenton. Each of you, and/or your clients as the case may be, is welcome and encouraged to attend.

Yours truly,

Edward J. Egan

EJE/rq

cc: David W. Reger,  
Deputy Attorney General